

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include changes to Figures 1-3. The attached "Replacement Sheets," which include Figures 1-4, replace the original sheets including Figures 1-4.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are now pending in the application. Claims 1 and 4-10 are currently amended. Claims 11-17 have been added as new. No new matter has been added, as all amendments are supported by the specification, claims, and drawings as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheets" Applicant has added the legend --Prior Art-- to Figures 1-3. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

SPECIFICATION

Applicant has amended the specification to correspond to the amended claims. The abstract has been amended to contain fewer than 150 words.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Stewart et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,155,133). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Stewart is at best directed to a controller that includes a memory for storing the data describing the temperature of the avalanche photodiode. The controller includes

an analog to digital conversion circuit for receiving an analog signal corresponding to the temperature of the avalanche photodiode. During the operation, the controller senses the temperature, refers a lookup table to generate a control signal corresponding to the temperature to APD power supply to control reverse-bias voltage of the avalanche photodiode (see column 9, lines 1-19; and abstract of Stewart).

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims and the cited reference differ in the following aspects.

First, in claim 1, the detection of the optical power differs from that of Stewart. Stewart does not anticipate that the optical receiver module is standardized before applied. After standardization, a voltage output circuit of optical power detection detects an analog voltage of optical power which is then converted into digital data, and the CPU obtains the optical power based on the digital data of the analog voltage and an AD value stored during the standardization. Different optical receiver modules are standardized respectively before applied, thus, the detection of the optical power would not be affected by difference between different optical receiver modules, and the detection is more accurate. In Stewart, on the other hand, the detection of the optical power is based on a formula, without taking into account the difference between different optical receiver modules, which is less accurate than the claimed invention.

Second, in claim 1, as the dark current of one optical receiver module may vary at different temperatures, the dark current compensation at different temperatures is carried out. Thus, the detection of the optical power in the claimed system is more

accurate at different temperatures because of the dark current compensation. Stewart does not anticipate dark current compensation.

Third, Stewart does not anticipate that the A/D converter monitors a bias voltage of the optical detector in real time. Thus, the bias voltage can be adjusted in time and more accurately. Stewart at best discloses that the bias voltage is not monitored, and the bias voltage can not be adjusted in time. As a result, the bias voltage may reach the breakdown voltage easily and the APD may break down. Thus, the function of the A/D converter and the adjustment of the bias voltage differs from that of Stewart.

Claim 4 of the present invention describes a method corresponding to the module described in Claim 1, thus Stewart also fails to anticipate claim 4. In claim 4, optical power is detected based on the standardization, and the dark current compensation is carried out. Further, the bias voltage is monitored and adjusted in time. While Stewart at best discloses the adjustment of the bias voltage based on the temperature, and the optical power is detected based on a formula.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 4, 11, and 14 define over the prior art. Likewise, because claims 2-3 depend from claim 1, claims 5-10 depend from claim 4, claims 12-13 depend from claim 11, and claim 15-17 depend from claim 14, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-3, 5-10, 12-13, and 15-17 also define over the art cited by the Examiner. Thus Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 08-0750, under Order No. 9896-000050/US/NP from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: August 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Joseph M. Lafata/
Joseph M. Lafata
Registration No.: 37,166
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1223
Attorney for Applicant

Attachments